

Session 21-05, a Regular Meeting of the Public Works Campus Task Force was called to order by Chair Donna Aderhold at 2:30 p.m. on April 14, 2021 via Zoom Webinar from the City Hall Conference Room located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

PRESENT: MEMBERS ENGBRETSSEN, ARGUETA, SLONE, VENUTI, KEISER, ADERHOLD, AND BARNWELL

STAFF: RENEE KRAUSE, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

AGENDA APPROVAL

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the agenda.

VENUTI/BARNWELL - MOVED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

Chair Aderhold stated that the agenda required amending to move the Informational Item B to New Business item C so the Task Force can discuss and take action. She requested a motion.

VENUTI/ARGUETA MOVED TO AMEND THE AGENDA TO MOVE INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS ITEM B TO NEW BUSINESS ITEM C.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Chair Aderhold inquired if there was any further discussion on the motion as amended.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENTS UPON MATTERS ALREADY ON THE AGENDA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting Minutes for March 24, 2021

Chair Aderhold requested a motion to approve the minutes.

VENUTI/BARNWELL MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 2021.

There was no discussion.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

VISITORS/PRESENTATIONS

REPORTS

PENDING BUSINESS

- A. Probable Risks Table & Report
 - Draft Memorandum to City Council
 - Risks Table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and invited Ms. Engebretsen to speak to the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen reviewed the work that the Task Force did at the previous meeting and she was unable to finish the table but will be able to at the worksession. She then addressed her draft memorandum to City Council and wanted consensus on the recommendations 1 and 2.

She reviewed conclusions providing a brief synopsis for Member Barnwell and requested his opinion on them since he was not at those meetings.

Member Barnwell disagreed with Member Slone points on probability that he raised. He stated the following:

- The DGGS report and analysis is authoritative and that the report shows calculations for the probabilities with the different scenarios shown in that report and those are reflected on the maps.
- He should have spoken up in earlier meetings that the information reflected in the report and maps are an assessment of probability in themselves
- The lines on the maps are the result of computer modeling which takes in all the factors – earthquake magnitude, elevations - that are listed in the report.
- DGGS has presented the scenarios with the worst case scenario going right through the Public Works Campus.

Mr. Barnwell related a conversation with Dr. Salisbury three weeks prior regarding the percentage of probability on the worst case scenario happening, Dr. Salisbury responded that he could not, but asked the question in return, if the City really wanted to take that risk. This science is not as exacting. Member Barnwell expressed that to his professional experience the risk is serious.

Discussion ensued on the applicability of Conclusion 1 as presented in the draft memorandum. Points were made on the following:

- The building is old and is no longer really suitable, not ADA compliant
- If an event happens it will be catastrophic, probability may be low but there is no way to predict an event.
- Materials and supplies need alternative storage locations in reason since they would be required if an event happened.

- Personnel could be assisting in other ways in an event if they were not required to focus on relocating equipment.
- The table clearly identifies that Public Works is a valuable and critical part of the city's infrastructure.
- Plans should be directed at relocating the facility since data does not support investing in the current location.
- Even a smaller event similar to the one that was presented in video from Santa Cruz can cause devastation.
- Focus should be on the consequences not on probability.

A brief discussion ensued on the drafting of the memorandum to City Council from Task Force. The following edits were made to page 9-10 of the packet:

- Lines 27-28 on page 9 of the packet was not quite correct and should be deleted.
- Lines 28-30 is good, but the verbiage of line 29-30 there is a question on who defines what is dependable.
- Add the statement, The State of Alaska Geological Survey which is the authoritative expert has determined a number of scenarios that would cause catastrophic damage to the lower elevations of the coastal part of Homer.
- Add Geological Survey cannot provide a specific probability but the scenarios are based on computer modeling.
- When a warning is received there is no information

Member Keiser joined the meeting at 3:10 p.m. and Chair Aderhold brought her up to speed on the discussion on the table.

Member Keiser provided her understanding of the information and how that would affect the Public Works Campus and resulting damages.

Member Barnwell provided the correct impact that would be experienced by the Public Works Campus in a worst case scenario which could happen tomorrow or 100 years from now. He further explained that even if an event happened and Public Works was not affected as bad as other areas they would be needed to mitigate other areas of the city that it would happen such as the Homer Spit.

Chair Aderhold reminded the Task Force that the maximum inundation is 50 feet which means that Public Works could be 20 feet under water.

Member Engebretsen stated that is the message that needs to be presented to the public along with clarification that even if the water level is only a couple of feet it would erode the areas around the building which would be detrimental to the foundation of the building.

Further comments from the Task Force were made on the following:

- level of water, debris contents in the water and time period with regards to the amount of damage received by the facility
- the unknown science of Cook Inlet, Gulf of Alaska or Shelikof Strait

Member Engebretsen reviewed the requirements of the Resolution 20-125 and noted the items that she would address for the worksession. She initiated a brief discussion on the table to fill in the following:

- RV Holding Tanks capacity
- The existing coverage that the City maintains versus the actual cost of replacement in the vicinity of \$12-14 million dollars
- Disruptions to sewer treatment operations and mitigation options would be cleaning and repair of damages to the building, such as replacement of wiring.

Member Engebretsen stated that she would short and long term cost estimates as well as the revised Council memorandum.

Member Keiser noted that the information for the Public Works Facility from the CIP would be really helpful on costs.

Deputy City Clerk Krause will forward that information to Member Engebretsen and include in the packet for the worksession.

Chair Aderhold noted the email submitted by Member Slone supporting the determination of general risk assessment of low, medium and high and that there would be a low risk but high consequence and recommended that the Task Force formally adopt a statement reflecting those determinations or one similar.

Member Barnwell requested clarification of the raw date mentioned and what type of low probability model Member Slone referenced in his email. Member Slone requested a few minutes to review his email.

Chair Aderhold called for a brief break at 3:32 p.m. She called the meeting back to order at 3:36 p.m.

Member Slone stated that his reference was raw data, not raw date. He then reviewed the actions and discussion from the last meeting which at the time the Task Force seemed to concur with that statement regarding the low risk, high consequence analysis. He then figured that they would need to adopt it formally by motion but now it seems that they do not agree with that and reversing the decision.

Chair Aderhold reviewed the discussion on the requirements of the Resolution that tasked them to come up with a probability which is not possible and that they can make that statement at the beginning and they can approve the memorandum before submitting it to Council.

Further discussion points were made on the following:

- The Task Force is not the experts, that is the State of Alaska Geological Survey who is putting the authoritative analysis out there that states the risks Homer is or will face
- There are six different scenarios presented
- Any of them could happen at any time now or in the future
- Do not have to reinvent the probability model, it has already been done
- Decision is needed to determine if the Public Works infrastructure should be exposed to the risks that are outlined in the report.

Deputy City Clerk Krause noted a point of order that the Resolution 20-125 did not require the Task Force to determine probability of a tsunami but the probable risks that would be incurred if one happened. She further noted that page 19 in the packet showed the goals that were requested by City Council.

Member Keiser stated that she agreed with Ms. Krause and then explained why she wanted the Task Force to be formed.

- b. Identifying Strategies for the Mitigation of Risks
 - Identify strategies for each risk identified in the table

Chair Aderhold introduced the item and opened the floor to discussion.

Member Keiser requested clarification on line 30-32 in the memorandum.

Member Engebretsen explained that they discussed that sentence and it will be removed.

Discussion was facilitated by Member Engebretsen on portions of the table and the following amendments and comments were made:

- Adding information regarding worst case scenario to loss of life in the workers section

A difference of opinion was expressed on the event that would trigger the worst case scenario that would affect the Public Works Campus and the time that would be available to evacuate the facility ensued with Member Slone requesting the time to review the record to bring back to the next meeting his findings and advocated that if the Task Force is to make a decision based on the science then they should defer to the scientists.

Chair Aderhold noted that they were only working on the details and not making any decisions at this meeting. She further commented on the value to the overall discussion and inquired if there were any further comments on that particular topic, adding that if there is no known information, then they must use the information provided in the worst case scenario, noting that if a tsunami caused by an underwater landslide in Kachemak Bay would be a very fast moving event and difficult to respond to quickly.

Member Engebretsen responding to Chair Aderhold that she believed they had all the information needed to complete the table and then recounted the next worksession to review and amend the draft which can then be approved at the April 28th. They will then have a final document ready for the May 10th Council meeting on Goal #1.

- c. Short & Long Term Costs for Mitigation Strategies
 - Identify short and long term costs involved for each of the mitigation strategies identified for each of the risks shown in the table.

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and open the floor to discussion.

A brief discussion was facilitated by Members Keiser and Engebretsen on the following:

- Is it necessary to move the whole facility or just the majority
- Prior space planning and dimensional issues
 - o Requirements for newer equipment used by other departments
- Bring information for review during the worksession

NEW BUSINESS

a. Current and Future Needs for the Public Works Department

- Identify and categorize the current and future needs in relation to the facility that the department would require.

Chair Aderhold introduced the item by reading of the title and opened the discussion by commenting on the overlap within the topics since they just touched on this topic but requested any additional future needs that Member Keiser could possibly list.

Member Keiser responded with the following needs for Public Works:

- Additional covered storage for equipment
- Larger mechanical shop
- Office and storage space for Parks Department
- Storage for supplies
- Size of the existing Public Works is roughly 2.5-2.75 acres but this does not include the Animal Shelter or the Water Sewer Treatment Plant, snow storage, etc.
- Conceptual plan is 4.6 acres however some things such as the gravel or sand pile could be maintained at the existing site
- New facility would need to allow for more parking

b. Next Steps

Chair Aderhold reviewed the potential items for the worksession agenda as follows:

- Memorandum to Council and Table

c. Public Works Campus Task Force Approved Meeting Schedule

Chair Aderhold introduced the item noting that this was moved from the Informational materials to address the following concerns expressed regarding the accessibility of the meetings to the public as follows:

- Average person is working during the time the meetings are scheduled.
- Due to the complexity and depth of the discussions it would be hard to follow just by reading the minutes.
- A webpage would not be adequate information for the general public.

Chair Aderhold opened the floor to discussion.

A discussion ensued on the following topics:

- information being available on the website and the public has the ability now to listen and view the meeting at any time;
- Complaints if any, received by the Clerk
- Staff members would prefer a later meeting time since this time does interrupt their normal work day
- Keeping the meeting dates of the second and fourth Wednesdays is preferred due to other city meetings
- Preference for later meeting time expressed by members to accommodate their work schedules.

VENUTI/SLONE MOVED TO AMEND THE MEETING TIME TO START AT 4:30 P.M.

There was a brief discussion on the new time being applicable to the worksessions.

VOTE. NON-OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

Motion carried.

Member Venuti will inform Councilmember Smith on the change in their meeting time.

INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS

- a. Resolution 20-125 Creating the Public Works Campus Task Force and Assigning Scope of Work
- b. Inundation Maps

A brief discussion was held on including the Tsunami Report in the worksession packet or if the document could be provided on the meeting page on the City website since it was so large. It was determined that the document could be available on the website as all the members had their paper copies from the previous meeting.

COMMENTS OF THE AUDIENCE

COMMENTS OF THE CITY STAFF

Deputy City Clerk Krause expressed her appreciation for the change in the meeting time to make it easier for the public to attend the meetings and advised the Task Force of the vacancies on the other advisory bodies.

COMMENTS OF THE TASK FORCE

Member Venuti commented on the weather warming up and noticed that Member Argueta did not have his bike hanging up on the wall behind him so she was hoping he was able to get out a ride and then noted that Council just approved a Resolution in support of Fairbanks to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. She expressed her concerns for all cyclists safety. Ms. Venuti appreciated everyone's

serving on this Task Force knowing that they serve on multiple committees and its really nice getting to know everyone.

Chair Aderhold thanked everyone and expressed that they had some very good, productive discussions today.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Task Force the meeting adjourned at 4:23 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 28, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. A worksession is scheduled on Wednesday, April 21, 2021 at 4:30 p.m. at the City Hall Cowles Council Chambers via Zoom Webinar located at 491 E. Pioneer Avenue, Homer, Alaska.

RENEE KRAUSE, MMC, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Approved: _____